

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

IN RE E.V.

No. 2 CA-JV 2018-0184
Filed November 30, 2018

THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.
NOT FOR PUBLICATION
See Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. 111(c)(1); Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 28(a)(1), (f);
Ariz. R. P. Juv. Ct. 103(G).

Appeal from the Superior Court in Pima County
No. JV20150630
The Honorable Susan A. Kettlewell, Judge Pro Tempore

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Joel Feinman, Pima County Public Defender
By Susan C. L. Kelly, Assistant Public Defender, Tucson
Counsel for Appellant

IN RE E.V.
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Chief Judge Eckerstrom authored the decision of the Court, in which Presiding Judge Staring and Judge Brearcliffe concurred.

E C K E R S T R O M, Chief Judge:

¶1 In 2016, appellant E.V. was adjudicated delinquent and the juvenile court placed him on a twelve-month term of probation. After E.V. admitted violating the terms of his probation, the court continued him on probation for an additional six months in December 2017. That probation term was again extended in July 2018 after E.V. admitted again violating probation. Following his admission to further violations in August, the court ordered that E.V. be placed on intensive probation until his eighteenth birthday.

¶2 Counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Leon*, 104 Ariz. 297 (1969). See also *In re Maricopa Cty. Juv. Action No. JV-117258*, 163 Ariz. 484, 486 (App. 1989) (juveniles adjudicated delinquent have constitutional right to *Anders* appeal). Counsel states that, based on her review, the only “arguable issue which appears to exist” is whether the juvenile court abused its discretion in imposing intensive probation.

¶3 Based on our review of the record, we find no reversible error. The record supports the juvenile court’s findings that E.V.’s admissions were knowing, voluntary, and intelligent and that he provided an adequate factual basis to support those admissions. See Ariz. R. P. Juv. Ct. 32(D)(2). And the record establishes the court appropriately exercised its discretion in placing E.V. on intensive probation. See A.R.S. §§ 8-341(A)(1)(b), 8-352; *In re John G.*, 191 Ariz. 205, ¶ 8 (App. 1998) (“We will not disturb a juvenile court’s disposition order absent an abuse of discretion.”).

¶4 We affirm the juvenile court’s finding that E.V. violated his probation and its disposition imposing intensive probation until his eighteenth birthday.